

1 Blake L. Harrop
2 Senior Assistant Attorney General
3 Antitrust Bureau
4 Office of the Illinois Attorney General
5 100 W. Randolph Street
6 Chicago, Illinois 60601
7 (312) 814-1004 (phone)
8 (312) 814-4209 (fax)
9 bharrop@atg.state.il.us

10 *Counsel for Intervenor, the State of Illinois*
11 (Other counsel are listed in signatures)

12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

14 IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE
15 (CRT) ANTITRUST
16 LITIGATION

17 This Document Relates To All
18 Indirect Purchaser Actions
19 .

20 No. CV-07-5944-SC
21 MDL No. 1917

22 Courtroom: One, 17th Floor
23 Judge: Honorable Samuel Conti

24 **Ex Parte Motion of States of Illinois,**
25 **Oregon and Washington to Extend**
26 **Time to Respond to IPPs' Motion for**
Preliminary Approval

1 The States of Illinois, Oregon and Washington move for an extension of time to
 2 respond to the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary approval of their
 3 settlement with the LG defendants until October 7, 2013.

- 4 1. The proposed settlement adopts the definition of the class being settled from
 5 the Fourth Amended Complaint. Within the context of that complaint, it is
 6 clear that there is no class seeking recovery of damages on behalf of the
 7 citizens of Illinois, Oregon and Washington.
 8
- 9 2. The issue of the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs' ability to settle and release the
 10 claims of the citizens of our three states was previously addressed. The issue
 11 arose in the context of the IPP settlement with Chunghwa and resulted in the
 12 intervention by these States in the spring of 2011. The IPPs resolved the
 13 issues as to Oregon and Washington with the exclusion of the citizens of
 14 those states from the IPP settlement class. The issue of Illinois'
 15 representation was litigated before Special Master Legge, who ruled in
 16 Illinois' favor. The class definitions in the IPP settlement with Chunghwa
 17 were modified accordingly.
 18
- 19 3. Since the filing of the motion for preliminary approval, our States have been
 20 in discussions with both counsel for the LG defendants and counsel for the
 21 IPPs. It appears that this issue will be resolved with some language
 22 modifications, but final language for these modifications may not be resolved
 23 before the current September 30, 2013 deadline for responses to the motion.
 24
- 25 4. If these issues cannot be resolved, they would affect the form of notice and
 26 would have to be litigated as part of the preliminary approval process.

1 However, the parties expect to resolve the issues before October 7, so if the
2 extension is granted, litigation of these issues would be avoided. The
3 extension will not affect the date for hearing of the motion.

4 5. The IPPS and LG consent to extending the states' time for responses to the
5 motion to October 7, 2013.

6
7 DATED: September 27, 2013

8 Respectfully submitted,

9 LISA MADIGAN,
10 Attorney General of Illinois

ROBERT M. MCKENNA
Attorney General of Washington

11 By: /s/ Blake L. Harrop
12 Blake L. Harrop
13 Senior Assistant Attorney General
14 Antitrust Bureau
15 Office of the Illinois Attorney General
16 100 W. Randolph Street
17 Chicago, Illinois 60601
18 (312) 814-1004
19 bharrop@atg.state.il.us

By: /s/ David M. Kerwin
David M. Kerwin
Assistant Attorney General
Antitrust Division
Washington State Attorney General's
Office
800 5th Ave, Ste. 2000
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 464-7030
(206) 464-6338 (fax)
davidk3@atg.wa.gov

18 ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
19 Attorney General of Oregon

20 By: /s/ Tim D. Nord
21 Tim D. Nord, OSB No. 882800
22 Senior Assistant Attorney General
23 1162 Court Street, NE
24 Salem, OR 97301-4096
25 (503) 943-4400
26 (503) 225-1257 (fax)
Tim.D.Nord@doj.state.or.us